



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,728	10/09/2003	Wei Sun	03226.475001; P8956	1630
33615 7590 03/27/2008 OSHA LIANG I.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C				
ART UNIT 2136		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/27/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com  
hernandez@oshaliang.com  
DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/683,728

**Applicant(s)**

SUN ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO

**Art Unit**

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/26/2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. In response to communications filed on 02/26/2008, applicant cancels claims 1-26; adds claims 27-47. The following claims, claims 27-47 are presented for examination.

### ***Response to Remarks/Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, pages 8-12, with respect to the rejection of claims 27-47 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.1 In response to Applicant argument that the Cheng and Botz references do not teach or suggest artifacts as recited in the claims, the Examiner respectfully disagrees citing column1 lines 47-50 – "user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user" and column 1 lines 52-60 which specifically recites user information (artifacts) such as "credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security

Art Unit: 2136

number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another.” Applicant has not overcome the rejection.

3.2 In response to Applicant argument that the Cheng and Botz references do not teach or suggest a central server system of any kind, the Examiner respectfully disagrees referencing Figure 1 element 20 which clearly discloses a server central to the data network. Applicant has not overcome the rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 27-31, 33-35, 37-45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being disclosed by Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent 7,010,582 B1).

[Examiner's Reasoning: The Examiner understands the disclosed “number of MDSSO (multiple domain, single sign-on) servers” (col. 5 line 43 – col. 6 line 2) to read upon the multiple “applications” (first application, second application, etc.)

as these "applications" are functioning as servers and performing the duties or services of a server. Anyone skilled in the art would understand the disclosed "applications" to be the software or applications which operates servers, such as the servers disclosed by Cheng et al.]

Regarding claim 27-28, 34-35, 41-42, Cheng et al., discloses a method for managing access to a plurality of applications using a central server, comprising: receiving a user name and a user password of a user from a first application (col.1 lines 47-50 – "user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user"); generating identity assertion information using the user name and the user password (col. 2 lines 12-36 – "network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device"); generating a first artifact associated with the identity assertion information (col. 1 lines 52-60 – "sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another"); sending the first artifact to the first application (col. 1 lines 52-60 – "sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another"); receiving the first artifact and a request for the identity assertion information from

a second application, wherein the second application receives the first artifact from the first application (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”); verifying the validity of the first artifact upon receipt from the second application(col. 6 lines 53-59 – “the authentication front end 22, after successful validation, generates an MDSSO cookie and sends this back to the user in the header portion of a message which also redirects the user’s browser to access the server’s MDSSO function 24”); and sending the identity assertion information to the second application, wherein the second application uses the identity assertion information to authorize the user to access the second application (col. 6 lines 53-59 – “the authentication front end 22, after successful validation, generates an MDSSO cookie and sends this back to the user in the header portion of a message which also redirects the user’s browser to access the server’s MDSSO function 24”).

Regarding claim 29, 36, 43, Cheng et al., discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the identity assertion information is stored in the central server (Figure 1 element 20).

Regarding claim 30, 37, 44, Cheng et al., discloses the method of claim 27, wherein the first artifact comprises a type code, a source identification, and an

assertion identification (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”); sending the first artifact to the first application (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”).

Regarding claim 31, 38, 45, Cheng et al., discloses the method of claim 30, wherein the first artifact further comprises a server identification (col.1 lines 47-50 – “user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user”).

Regarding claim 33, 40 and 47, Cheng et al., discloses the method of claim 27, wherein the user name and the user password are obtained by the first application from a web browser (col. 1 line 15 – “web-browser”) and col.1 lines 47-50 – “user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user”).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 32, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US Patent No. 7,010,582 B1) and further in view of Botz et al. (US Patent Application No. 2003/0177388 A1).

Regarding claim 32, 36 and 46, Cheng et al., Cheng et al. is silent in disclosing the method as described in Claim I, wherein said assertion information and said plurality of artifacts substantially comply with a Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML) standard, and said network of trusted partner sites facilitates web browser single sign-on capabilities using interoperational protocols substantially complying with said SAML standard, however Botz et al. does disclose such a method (0066 of Botz et al. – "ITTs and ITTRs could be stored as published XML documents which could be stored further implemented using the Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML), which is a proposed standard.").

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, the have been motivated to combine the system and method for providing interactions between multiple servers and an end user with the authentication identity translation within a multiple computing unit environment of Botz et al...Cheng hints towards the possible benefit of such a combination in the recitation of the need for a "some standard data format should be agreed upon to pass the information from site to site.

Furthermore, preferably this passing of confidential information should be done in a secure fashion, by using some sort of cryptographic means for example (col. 11 lines 47-52)." Botz et al. provides motivation for the combination in the description of, "the emerging web services computing model, [in which] the various AIT logical processes e.g., Domain Controller and interface services could be implemented as published and subscribed to web accessible services. Likewise, ITTs and ITTRs could be stored as published XML documents which could be further implemented using the Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML), which is a proposed standard." Clearly there is motivation and benefit to modify the invention of Cheng towards compliance with a technology, namely SAML which is a proposed standard.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO whose telephone number is (571)272-2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 2:30 - 6:00, TR 9:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. C. O./

Examiner, Art Unit 2136

March 26, 2008

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136